AIR UNIVERSITY EVALUATION PROGRAMS

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

NOTICE: This publication is available electronically on the Maxwell AFB Electronic Publications web page at: http://www.maxwell.af.mil/msd/pubs/library.htm. If you lack access contact the Publications Management office.

OPR: HQ AU/CFA	Certified by: HQ AU/CFA
(Mr. Stephen Harris)	(Dr. Dorothy D. Reed)
Supersedes AUI 36-2312, 19 July 2002	Pages: 8
	Distribution: F

This instruction establishes policies, procedures, and techniques designed to implement evaluation programs in Air University (AU) colleges and schools. It complements information contained in AFMAN 36-2234, *Instructional System Development;* AFI 36-2301, *Professional Military Education*; AFI 36-2601, AU Sup 1, *Air Force Personnel Survey Program*, AUI 36-2304, *AU Formal Schools;* AUI 36-2306, *Air University Curriculum and Program Review;* AUI 36-2322, *Air University Institutional Effectiveness and Institutional Research;* AUI 36-105, *Faculty Development. Enrichment and Responsibilities;* and AUI 36-2303, *Recognition of Outstanding Student Achievement*. This instruction applies to all AU schools and courses.

SUMMARY OF REVISIONS

This document is substantially revised and should be thoroughly reviewed. This revision adds faculty evaluation guidance formerly found in AUI 36-105, *Faculty Development, Enrichment, and Evaluation.* New guidance is added to: ensure policy and oversight guidance relative to faculty evaluation; addresses the need for colleges and schools to establish appropriate test control processes; requires the development of an appropriate set of evaluation criteria for faculty linked to faculty development and the curricula of the schools; requires evaluation systems at the colleges and schools for both resident and non-resident programs; and requires Air University colleges and schools to modify their evaluation operating instructions to ensure "closed-loop" documentation of their evaluation program generated data. A star (★) indicates changes since the last revision.

★**1. Evaluation Terms and Policy.** Each of the schools and colleges that comprise Air University are educational/academic programs. Each program is composed of various supporting elements such as courses, student evaluations and feedback, faculty certification, evaluation and observation, etc. The primary goal of evaluation at Air University is to improve and ensure the continued quality of all educational programs. Evaluation assesses the

effectiveness and value of educational programs and their supporting elements, provides findings to planners and decision makers, and provides a means for feedback to faculty and students. All colleges and schools will have a formal system of internal evaluation as required by guidance found in AFMAN 36-2234, *Instructional System Development*. This pertains to both resident and non-resident programs. In addition, academic programs of more than 15 academic days will have a formal system of external evaluation. Each college/school must ensure that its evaluation program provides sufficient and appropriate data for curriculum improvement and overall program decisions. These decisions will be documented internally at each college/school to ensure a "closed loop" process. This process of documentation is instrumental to Air University's institutional effectiveness efforts. External evaluation of international officer graduates is not required.

★1.1. Internal Evaluation. Internal evaluation pertains to evaluation of the academic program. It includes evaluation of students, guest and faculty speakers, all teaching faculty, instruction, instructional media, curricula, and supporting facilities and services that contribute to the educational effort.

★1.1.1. Faculty Evaluation. The primary focus for faculty evaluation is to provide diagnostic feedback to faculty members to enhance their professional growth and development. A secondary focus is to assess faculty member performance. A college/school's faculty evaluation process should include, as a minimum, supervisory feedback/evaluations and student feedback. Guidance and procedures for this process will be documented and included in the college/school's evaluation plan and will be briefed during the college's/school's scheduled program review board (PRB) as part of the discussion on the evaluation system required by AUI 36-2306, *Air University Curriculum and Program Review*.

★1.1.1.1. Faculty Performance Evaluation. A college's/school's faculty performance evaluation program includes, as a minimum for degree granting colleges and schools, a record of faculty credentials to include transcripts and supervisory feedback/evaluations. Non-degree granting colleges/schools are not required to maintain faculty transcripts in faculty folders unless required by memorandum of understanding for affiliation requirements (example: affiliation with the Community College of the Air Force). Student feedback will be retained in a way deemed most appropriate by the college/school. Guidance and procedures for this process will be documented and included in the college's/school's evaluation plan.

★1.1.1.2. Teaching Competencies and Evaluation Instruments. As there is no generally accepted standard set of teaching competencies, colleges and schools should develop sets of competencies to suit their specific needs. These competencies will be briefed during the college's/school's scheduled PRB as part of the discussion on faculty development required by AUI 36-2306. The Air University Council of Deans (COD) will review the competencies on an annual basis to ensure that the criteria are linked to faculty development and the curricula of the schools. Once this is done, the COD will validate and document in the minutes of the meeting that Air University needs are being met. Colleges/schools requiring assistance in developing specific teaching

competencies should contact AU/CFA for assistance. Colleges/schools should use either AETC Form 620, **Academic Instructor Monitoring Checklist**, MAFB Form 10, **Multipurpose Instructor Evaluation**, or MAFB Form 185, **Instructor Observation**, to assess the teaching competencies deemed important for their instructional programs.   If none of these instruments are accomodating to a school's/college's needs, the school/college should contact their Forms Management Office for assistance in requesting a waiver and developing an instrument of their own.

★1.1.1.3. Supervisory Evaluations. Firmly base supervisory assessments of faculty performance on observations made against a standard set of teaching competencies that meet the needs of the college/school. To be most effective, supervisors provide feedback to the faculty member as soon as practical following the evaluation. Documention of supervisory feedback should be accomplished and maintained according to processes developed internally at each college/school.

★1.1.1.4. Student Feedback on Faculty. Colleges/schools develop student feedback instruments to obtain information about faculty performance from the student's perspective. Thus, students should not be expected to observe all of the instructional nuances that a supervisor might observe. Student feedback instruments should direct students to comment on areas of instruction that are important to them, such as:

★1.1.1.4.1.   Intellectual stimulation: Course/lesson content is well organized, presented clearly, engaging to students, etc.

★1.1.1.4.2.   Interpersonal rapport: Instructor is open to discussion, focused on student learning, concerned with integration of lesson to previously learned material, etc.

★1.1.1.5. Peer Feedback on Faculty. Colleges/Schools may also wish to encourage their faculty to informally seek peer feedback from a trusted faculty member and to engage in self-evaluation. If used, peer or self-evaluations should be honored as private information and not subjected to public or official audit.

★1.1.2. Student Evaluation. Student evaluation identifies and measures the amount and type of learning.   It may involve such methods as pre-testing and post-testing, achievement testing, rating or ranking of individuals, and observing and critiquing performance. Colleges/schools should ensure internal policies and procedures provide adequate and appropriate test security/control measures for student evaluation materials.

★1.1.2.1. Test control. Test materials should be controlled at the level deemed necessary by the college/school to prevent compromising academic test security. Academic test materials may include any paper or electronic media containing student/faculty versions of the test, completed student answer sheets, and paper or electronic copies of any test items in any stage of test item development.

1.1.3. Curriculum Evaluation. Curriculum evaluation identifies and measures variables related to the educational process such as content, alternative methods of instruction, instructional resources, and the degree to which stated objectives are achieved at the appropriate instructional level. AU schools should include both cognitive and affective learning objectives in their curricula. Write all cognitive and affective objectives at a level that is reasonably achievable by the end of the course of instruction. Observation-based anecdotal records and survey research are acceptable formats for measuring affective objectives.

★1.2.   External (Field) Evaluation.   External evaluation consists of assessments of AU educational course or program effectiveness based on data gathered from sources outside the school. This data may include survey or interview comments solicited from HQ United States Air Force, Major Commands, Command Board of Advisors, AU Board of Visitors, course graduates, subordinates and supervisors of graduates.   When using sampling techniques, evaluators should assure a valid sample. A valid sample requires an adequate number of responses which are representative of the research population.   For more information on sample size, refer to AFMAN 36-2234, *Instructional System Development*, Chapter 7. If surveys are used to collect data, either traditional or web-based, the surveys must have a survey control number. Follow guidance in AFI 36-2601, *Air Force Personnel Survey Program* and Air University Supplement l to AFI 36-2601 for developing surveys and requesting survey control numbers.

2. Student Records. All schools develop, maintain, and use student academic records for evaluation, research, planning, and related purposes. See AUI 36-2304, *AU Formal Schools*, paragraph 5, for specific guidance related to student records.

3. HQ AU/CFA Responsibilities:

3.1. Provides oversight and advice on evaluation policy, procedures, and techniques.

3.1.1. Maintains a point of contact (POC) listing for AU evaluation programs.

★3.1.2. Conducts and documents random reviews of a college's/school's end-of-course (EOC) surveys for short courses/programs (ex: College of Professional Development conducted Professional Continuing Education (PCE) courses, Squadron Officer School and Air and Space Basic Course) or end-of-year (EOY) surveys for long programs (ex: Air War College (AWC), Air Command and Staff College (ACSC), School of Advanced Air and Space Studies (SAASS) and some Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT) programs) and other special analyses. AU/CFAE may also review sample test items and related analysis data.

★3.1.3.   AU/CFAE will schedule and perform an annual site visit to review school evaluation programs with the college/school POC. Feedback on the results of a review or site visit will be provided to the college's/school's evaluation POC and their commander/commandant.

3.1.4. Advises on significant changes impacting college/school evaluation programs.

3.1.5. Organizes and conducts meetings or workshops (on an as needed basis) to facilitate understanding and consistent practice of evaluation policies. This will be done through an established network of evaluation points of contact in AU colleges and schools.

★3.2. Reviews and recommends improvements (as needed) to evaluation plans submitted by AU colleges and schools as required by AUI 36-2306.

3.2.1. Assesses validity, comprehensiveness, and consistency of college/school evaluation plans.

3.2.2. Recommends (as needed) optional evaluation practices in relation to the specific college/school or course.

★3.2.3. Conducts and completes a college/school evaluation plan review prior to each college/school's scheduled program review board. The status of the school's evaluation plan will be reported to the PRB. A formal response of the AU/CFAE assessment of the evaluation plan will be sent to the Chief Academic Officer (AU/CF), college/school's commander/commandant and the college/school's evaluation point of contact. This will provide documentation as part of a "closed-loop" process ensuring Air University oversight of college/school evaluation programs.

4. AU Schools Responsibilities:

★4.1. Establishes, documents, and maintains a comprehensive "closed-loop" evaluation system for all resident and nonresident courses of instruction, including technology-based distance learning courses. Evaluation systems for all AU programs should include the following:

★4.1.1. Student achievement of learning objectives (formal testing). Programs which grant degrees, have formal accreditation relationships, award Air Force Specialty Codes (AFSC) or commission officers must include assessments of student achievement. Within a comprehensive evaluation system, schools should ensure internal policies and procedures provide adequate and appropriate test control/security measures. These programs are typically AU graduate education (AWC/ACSC/SAASS/AFIT), Professional Military Education, Officer Training School, Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps, technical training, and select PCE environments.

★4.1.2. Supervisor feedback/evaluation of faculty. Supervisor feedback/evaluation documentation should be maintained in a faculty member folder or similar mechanism.

★4.1.3. Student and faculty feedback on instructional techniques, methods, content, and course sequencing. Documentation and analysis of this data should be maintained and any follow-up actions taken by the school documented. This mechanism helps instill a

"closed-loop" analysis process for use in ensuring quality educational programs at Air University.

★4.1.4. Surveys (traditional or web delivered) of course graduates, supervisors, etc. regarding their perceptions of course adequacy. Documentation and analysis of this data should be maintained and actions taken by the school documented. (Note: all surveys must follow guidance found in AFI 36-2601, AU Supplement 1, *Air Force Personnel Survey Program).*

★4.1.5. Other areas necessary to assess and improve course or program effectiveness. The following areas should be addressed in EOC surveys for short courses/programs or EOY surveys for long programs to provide institutional effectiveness data for Air University: (1) How well the school's mission was accomplished and (2) The overall effectiveness of the instruction provided. It is suggested, in an effort to standardize collected data, that a 5-point Likert scale be used with the following descriptors - outstanding, excellent, satisfactory, marginal, and unsatisfactory. Documentation and analysis of these data should be maintained and actions taken by the college/school should be documented and reported to AU/CFAI. These two discrete data points should be added to future EOC and EOY surveys as a means to capture opinions concerning Air University institutional effectiveness.

4.2. AU schools and courses will forward an evaluation plan (an electronic copy is requested) to HQ AU/CFAE as part of the PRB process as described more fully in AUI 36-2306. A hard copy of these plans will be printed and kept in the HQ AU/CFAE office. These plans are an integral component of the AU Institutional Effectiveness effort. The college's/school's plan will be composed of the following applicable materials:

★4.2.1. A background paper describing the purpose and scope of the evaluation system.

★4.2.2. Implementing instructions, policies, and procedures concerning faculty evaluation, test control procedures, internal and external evaluation programs.

★4.2.3. Sample internal evaluation critique instruments such as: block, area, phase, EOC, EOY instruments, faculty evaluation/observation forms and student evaluation/observation forms.

★4.2.4. Sample graduate, supervisor, or other survey instruments with most current survey control numbers. This is in addition to the approval procedures and requirements outlined in AFI 36-2601/AU Supplement 1.

★4.3. Colleges/schools will develop and maintain survey analyses, and other special evaluation analyses. Examples are: EOC surveys/critiques for short courses, EOY surveys for long programs. Upon request, forward these data sets to AU/CFAE. Electronic versions are requested. Colleges/schools or programs requiring special submission procedures of analyses should coordinate such options with AU/CFAE. Comprehensive analyses typically include the following:

4.3.1. Class dates, student demographics, and when relevant, special curriculum changes for a given class. Notable facility impacts or other occurrences that might affect the course/program should be noted for documentation purposes.

4.3.2. Raw number of responses, percentage of response, a description of the research method (interview, survey, etc.), key characteristics of the population, and limiting factors of the research.

★4.3.3. Quantitative data for scale points for every item and include a written analysis per item as warranted. Provide the percentage distribution of responses rather than averages of scale values. Percentage of responses is a more valid measure. The quantitative section should conclude with a summary. Comparison and trend data for identical items from EOC surveys/critiques or EOY surveys, and graduate or supervisor surveys may be displayed and analyzed.

4.3.4. A qualitative report on open-ended questions usually summarizes the trends of written comments. Where applicable, associate written comments to results obtained in the quantitative section.

★4.3.5. Conclusions and recommendations that highlight key results, which note positives and negatives of the findings. Recommendations address actions for course improvement and often become open action items for subsequent reports when necessary. Include any follow-up actions taken by the college/school to address findings of the analysis. This helps ensure a "closed-loop" process and completes the documentation trail.

★**5.   Non-Resident Course Evaluation Support.** The Air Force Institute for Advanced Distributed Learning (AFIADL) supports College for Enlisted Professional Military Education, Squadron Officer College, and ACSC non-resident course evaluation programs through its Course Analysis Report (CAR) and through its test item analysis. AFIADL also provides advice on other non-resident programs working through AU/CFAD, Chief, Educational Technology for technology issues and AU/CFAE, Chief, Evaluation Programs, for evaluation issues.

★5.1. Forms Adopted: AETC Form 620, **Academic Instructor Monitoring Checklist**, MAFB Form 10, **Multipurpose Instructor Evaluation**, MAFB Form 185, **Instructor Observation**.

DONALD A. LAMONTAGNE
Lieutenant General, USAF
Commander, Air University

Attachment 1

GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

References

AFI 36-2601, *Air Force Personnel Survey Program*, and AU Supplement 1

AFI 36-2301, *Professional Military Education*

AFMAN 36-2234, *Instructional System Development*

AUI 36-105, *Faculty Development, Enrichment and Responsibilities*

AUI 36-2303, *Recognition of Outstanding Student Achievement*

AUI 36-2304, *Air University Formal Schools*

AUI 36-2306, *Air University Curriculum and Program Review*

AUI 36-2322, *Air University Institutional Effectiveness and Instutitional Research*

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACSC – Air Command and Staff College

AFIADL – Air Force Institute for Advanced Distributed Learning

AFIT – Air Force Institute of Technology

AU – Air University

AWC – Air War College

COD – Council of Deans

EOC – End of Course

EOY – End of Year

PCE – Professional Continuing Education

POC – Point of Contact

PRB – Program Review Board

SAASS – School of Advanced Air and Space Studies